LETTERS

FROM

Dr. FRANKLIN

[Price ONE SHILLING.]

LETTERS

FROM

Dr. FRANKLIN,

TO THE

EARL OF SHELBURNE.

"GOVERNMENT is the Art of Oppreſſion with Impunity."

LONDON.

LONDON:

Printed for M. FOLINGSBY, Temple-Bar; and J. DEBRETT, Piccadilly.

A

LETTER

FROM

Dr. FRANKLIN.

My LORD,

PERMIT me this method of communicating my ſentiments on what I conceive to be your ſyſtem of government. My deſign is, not to decry the man, but to develope the principle of meaſures which appear to me inimical to our empirial intereſts.

FROM education, habitudes, connections, and principles, you are profeſſedly, as well as practically, the ſervant of the crown. Here ariſes the danger of public welfare. When the ſervice of the crown is the ultimate of a miniſter's purſuits, it is too frequently ſeen to end in the oppreſſion of the people. The ſervice of the crown is the extenſion of its influence; and the extenſion of its influence can only be effected by reſtraining the principles of the ſubject. Prerogative is exerted to deſtroy what it was originally given to preſerve. It was beſtowed on the ſovereign to ſanctify his power of protection; but the ſervant of the crown makes it the protection of his own mal-exerted power. He looks on life, liberty, freehold, inheritance, and poſſeſſion, as the abſolute—not the delegated property of the crown. Thus the *ſenatus conſultum*, though not literally, is effectively the *principalis conſtitutio*. The law of the ſenate is the edict of the ſovereign. Our municipal laws, which were formed to defend the intereſts of cities, to maintain their rights and privileges, and to preſerve order and harmony among the

citizens

citizens themſelves, are merely the chains of their ſervitude. They are laws which enforce our obedience to tyranny. Our ſtatute laws—inſtead of directing our obedience to the common law of God and nature, agreeable to the neceſſity of local contingencies, for the welfare of the people, deſtroy the general cuſtoms of the realm, to eſtabliſh the particular ambition of the prince. Parliament is only aſſembled to vote taxes, deſtroy privilege, and encreaſe prerogative. 'The bleſſings of ſociety are what 'are bought and ſold at this national mart of 'politics. Liberty is here the footſtool of 'tyrants. Under the meaning of preſerving 'privileges, traitors are empowered to accumu-'late on their conſtituents every ſpecies of 'calamity. Taxes are voted on the people to 'pay that power which can only enſlave them. 'War is produced and encouraged for the ſup-'port of private emolument. Thus—for per-'ſonal contracts, ſocial lives and treaſures *have* '*been* ſacrificed. Here knaves not only plunder 'property,—betray confidence,—pervert ho-'nour,—and promote infamy,——but turn the

'power of protection into the means of deſtruc-
'tion. Taxes, that were deſigned to cut away
'the luxuriancies of commerce, and invigorate
'the general ſtem, here ſap its vitality, and
'leave the trunk withering beneath the united
'blaſt of perfidy, avarice, and ambition.'

But the common law which was anciently called the *folo-right*, *i. e.* the right of the people, is, in the hands of a *crown* miniſter, the uſurpation of the ſovereign.

And now, my Lord, having taken this general view of the tendency of a prime-minister's deſigns, which are ultimately directed for the ſervice of the crown, permit me to conſider what may be the conſequence of your principles with reſpect to America in particular. As you may now be ready to grant their independence from neceſſity, which you would not from principle, I think it incumbent on me to preſent what I conceive to be their abſolute right of independence. For in my opinion, unleſs you are as willing to grant their independence

dence from principle, as well as from neceſſity, you will find it received with reluctance—if not rejected with contempt. It is, therefore, the immediate intereſt of both countries, that their union ſhould be formed upon principle. Neceſſity you will find a very fallacious and deluſive ground for political negociation. The want of principle, in national as well as political law, is the only cauſe of national and political deſtruction. To prevent this being the conſequence with regard to America, is the immediate purpoſe of this letter. I would endeavour to convince you, that America ſhould, from *right*, be poſſeſſed of UNCONDITIONAL AND UNEQUIVOCAL INDEPENDENCE. For this purpoſe, let me prevail with your Lordſhip to trace, with me, the origin and eſtabliſhment of the colonies. It is, thus, we can only be able to trace what is abſolutely their rights and privileges.

IN recurring to the origin of the colonies, we ſhall find it the conſequence of your trade extending itſelf beyond its uſual limits in the

reign

reign of Queen Elizabeth. And in the eſtabliſhment of theſe colonies, we find three different ſpecies of government — the Royal, Charter, and Proprietary. The Royal government was, wherein the king, as in England, appointed the governor, council, and officers of ſtate, while the people had only the choice of repreſentatives in aſſembly, as in New Hampſhire, New York, New Jerſey, and the Corolinas—though the laſt were originally Proprietary governments. The Charter government was veſting the company with authority to eſtabliſh what form of government they choſe, provided its laws were not contrary to thoſe of England. If they enacted ſuch different laws, they forfeited their charter. This was the government of Rhode-Iſland, and originally in Maſſachuſets, Maine, and Plymouth, until their charters were adjudged forfeited, in the reign of King Charles the Second. It was, therefore, the charter granted by King William the Third reſerved to the crown the appointment of governor. Thus aroſe that mixture of government, which was the ſource of jealouſy between

the

the people and the governor. From this originated the diſputes in the Maſſachuſets; for it was there this government was particularly eſtabliſhed.

THE Proprietory government veſted the proprietor with the ſame power over his plantation as the king himſelf has over his dominions; —excepting the proprietor did not reſide on his plantation, the king's conſent was to be had in the choice of governor;—and if he did reſide in his plantation, neither his deputy govenor could be choſen without royal conſent.

IT is thus we perceive theſe different forms of government were adapted to the different tempers of the people to encourage them in colonization. Thoſe who went in ſearch of property were alſo tempted with the proſpect of liberty in the Charter government. The proprietors, being poſſeſſed of property, were only to be allured by the ſceptre of power in the Proprietary government. The others, who wanted neither power nor property, were only tempted to ſeek freedom in religion, and, therefore, they

ſo

ſo readily formed themſelves under the Royal government.

THUS far we have traced the origin and the reaſon of the different forms of government on which the colonies were at firſt eſtabliſhed. So that, from this view, we find that in the peopling of colonies different reaſons excite different people to emigrate. Thus, we perceive the reaſon of the colonizing monarch condeſcending to ſhare his power with a few, while he can withhold it from the reſt of his ſubjects. It can be with no other motive—than, at a future period, he or his ſucceſſors may be enabled to enſlave the whole. As the colonies thrive, he confines their ſtreams of commerce to his own ſhores. This brings him, with increaſe of revenue, increaſe of power. He is now tempted to try his ſtrength. But there are two great obſtacles to gratify his ambition. He finds one part has too much power—and another too much liberty. To make theſe coaleſce with each other is impoſſible. The firſt are too jealous to ſuffer a palpable dimunition of their power,

and

and the latter are too jealous to ſuffer a palpable reſtraint of their liberty. Some more indirect and unalarming means muſt be adopted. The only one found was the levying of taxes on them by your parliament. Could this have been eſtabliſhed, it would have effected the grand deſign. Liberty would never have been known by a Briton or his deſcendant. Being ſubject to a parliament wherein they had no power, would have been an additional weight to plunge the mother country, with themſelves, into the abyſs of ſlavery. But the Americans, the deſcendants of Britons, had too great an idea of liberty not to ſee the chimerical attempt to undermine the baſis of their exiſtence as a free people. Sophiſtry could not impoſe on them that vague poſition—*Taxation is no Tyranny.* They knew, and acknowledged, taxation is no tyranny with the conſent of the people. But, otherwiſe, they felt it; and, therefore, reſiſted it as the moſt deteſtable of tyranny. They treated it as the daſtardly attempt of a coward, who, under the garb of liberty, conceals the chains of oppreſſion. No wonder the people were rouſed to defend their natural and political rights. Your

roclamation againſt exporting gunpowder and ire-arms to America was the ſignal for defence. They underſtood it, and was prepared. In Pennſylvania was eſtabliſhed a powder-manufactory. The materials they dug from the earth on which it ſtood. They found gun-ſmiths ufficient to furniſh them with a hundred thouand ſtand of arms. Theſe reſources inſpired hem with confidence. They ſeemed to have a re-ſentiment that the whole united force of Britain could not ſubdue them. This was, ndeed, their boaſt; and that it was not the oaſt of preſumption, I believe you have too atally experienced. With this confidence, the our New England colonies, and thoſe of Virginia and Maryland, armed and put themſelves nto immediate diſcipline, with that ſpirit and lacrity which evinced their cauſe was death or reedom. They now felt their ſtrength. They aw the advantages of their country. Their oldiers were diſciplined accordingly. And when hey conſidered that your troops were differently rained—the diſtance they were to come—and our variety of exigence——a leſs degree of ſſurance would have degenerated into diffidence.

dence. But such was the idea of success, that they dared oppression to proceed. They even threatened, that if he left not their land, chastisement would be his fate. Oppression did proceed—and, through his sides, England has severely felt the execution of their menaces!

From this cursory view of the subject, we trace that the colonists were originally tempted, as the efficient cause of remote tyranny. The principles of their various governments were not those of legal necessity—but of ambitious policy. They were less formed to protect natural rights, than to flatter various dispositions. By thus flattering the variety of disposition, they meant to secure the possession of every species of wanton usurped power. It is, thus, we find that your colonies owed you no gratitude for your temporary encouragement and protection. The first was only given to nurse them into that strength of political existence, which made them an object worthy of your tyranny. And the latter was only to prevent them from being the slaves of another power, when you had been at so much trouble and expence to send them

into thoſe inhoſpitable regions as ſlaves to your-ſelves.

ALTHOUGH much has been ſaid with reſpect to the duty and gratitude of a colony to its parent ſtate, every liberal mind will ſee, they are merely terms of art uſed to ſupport the actions of thoſe who never felt the force of theſe relative ties. How can a people owe any gratitude for an advantage which has ariſen from a principle ultimately directed for their deſtruction? While they bleſs the conſequence, they muſt curſe the cauſe. As they increaſe in ſtrength, their minds in proportion alienate themſelves from thoſe national ties on which their infant weakneſs were obliged to depend. For political affection depends more upon neceſſity than principle. An immediate and neceſſary advantage naturally biaſſes the mind towards the agent—however inimical his intentions may be with reſpect to the real intereſt of the perſon obliged. It is, therefore, we obſerve the affections of colonies or dependent ſtates, towards the original ſtate from whence they emigrated, decreaſe in proportion to the increaſe of their political and commercial conſequence. Neceſ-

ſity,

ſity, which is the cable of affection in their firſt eſtabliſhment, diminiſhes to the ſpider's thread in their progreſs to independence. So that, in proportion to the ſtrength of a riſing colony, the greater care is neceſſary for the original ſtate to preſerve their affection. Inſtead of thinking them mature for oppreſſion, they ſhould conſider them as powerful for reſiſtance. When colonies no longer require our aid, their natural, as well as political right, is independence. To withhold the acknowlegement is a negative oppreſſion; but to extend our power, in proportion to their ſtrength, is poſitive tyranny. The neceſſity of protection was the firſt principle of individual and national allegiance. Allegiance, therefore, cannot extend beyond the neceſſity of protection. When a people can protect themſelves, no longer is allegiance due to the original ſtate. But as this is an aſſertion which goes much deeper than the ſuperficial principles on which the neceſſity of governments are uſually enforced, it may be proper to trace them yet farther, and conſider what *ſhould be*—not what *is*, the final cauſe of all governments.

THE

THE final cauſe of every ſpecies of government ſhould be to preſerve order, promote welfare, and protect poſſeſſion in whatever ſtate it may be eſtabliſhed. The individuals of a ſtate give power to one, few, or many, that he or they may give liberty to the whole. It is the only tenure by which they can hold their power. The monarch forfeits the ſceptre, the inſtant his ſubjects feel the rod of oppreſſion. The birth-right of kings is only the privilege of the name, while they exert their power in the happineſs of the people. And it was the neceſſity of preſerving this happineſs of the people in the order of ſocial avocations, the welfare of their perſonal intereſts, and the ſecurity of thoſe poſſeſſions which are peculiar to the ſoil, ſituation, and connexions of every country that gave birth to government. So that we find neceſſity—not privilege, is its origin. We may therefore deduce, that when a people are grown ſo politically and nationally mature as not to require your protection, you have no right to controul them with your power. A colony is only a ſhoot, that while it vegetates ſome diſtance from its parent

rent ſtem, grows mature from the ſame ſource of nouriſhment. But when it is mature, it finds a root of laws, branches of national connexions, and fruits of commerical advantages from its own natural ſtrength of exiſtence. Their natural poſſeſſion of power is their natural right of independence. It is thus I muſt eſpouſe the right of America to the full enjoyment of her independence from nature, juſtice, and policy.

And now having thus far inforced the right of America, let me conſider what may be the happineſs of a king and the proſperity of a people whom he has a right to govern.

The happineſs of a king, and the proſperity of a people conſiſts in ſovereign virtue. It runs from the ſtep of his throne through all the land. His *heart* is the fountain of happineſs or miſery. As that is pure or corrupt, ſo is the conſtitution. Thus, the freedom of the people is more a tacit demonſtration of the virtue of their king, than of themſelves. For the greateſt part of the people know not what is political virtue. They ſee not the remote tendency of contaminating

nating corruption. How can the generality of the people conceive, that a member of parliament can either be a buyer or ſeller of their liberties? They hear it talked of without knowing its meaning. But when a king, by his miniſters, offers the glittering bait, they are then too ſenſible of its virtue. The virtues are ſo immediately tangible, that they can no longer remain ignorant of the advantages which they can derive to themſelves. They know it will purchaſe themſelves a Sunday coat, or their wives a holiday gown. This makes them ignorantly, betray their rights to him, who, at the ſame time, knowingly, betrays his heart. He is ſo pityfully baſe, as to take advantage of their ignorance, and, thus, degrades himſelf ſo low as one of his recruiting ſerjeants. But, in truth, a recruiting ſerjeant only bribes to enſlave, while he bribes to tyrannize. Thus we ſee him dwindled beneath the meaneſt of his ſubjects. How does this accord with his aſpiring ambition! I ſpeak free—becauſe it is the privilege of my nature, and they are truths which I would not only ſpeak of to a king—for I ſee not that mighty difference between the private

man

man and the crowned monarch. If I ſee a difference between the ſubject and the ſovereign, it is in favour of the ſubject. The ſovereign owes the people more reſpect than the people owe the ſovereign. The confidence of a people, in reſigning their liberties to his protection, deſerves more reſpect and gratitude than he can poſſibly beſtow. He, therefore, is juſtly expoſed to the ſevereſt cenſure, in not having paid them all the attention in his power.

To know ourſelves, is thought the firſt of all knowledge. I believe it. But, at the ſame time, I think it relates more to kings than people.

It is thought the moſt difficult of all ſtudies to attain the knowledge of ourſelves. However, as far as this knowledge relates to kings knowing themſelves, I cannot term it any ſtudy. Study—if I rightly conceive it, is an intenſe application of the mind to attain any knowledge the heart deſires. And, as with kings, the

desire of the heart can only be wanted for this knowledge, I conceive it cannot be, in them, properly termed a study. For a glance of the mind will perfect their knowledge of themselves. A glance—I repeat, on the mirror which their subjects situation holds to their view, will be sufficient to perceive all their traits. If their subjects be free, they will find their traits are wisdom, moderation, clemency, and justice, crowned by glory and happiness. But if they be enslaved, the sovereign traits will be folly, ambition, cruelty, and injustice, tortured by infamy and misery.

As ideas of freedom may be different as well as other political ideas, give me leave to describe what are mine.

My idea of freedom is, what composes the absolute health of the constitution—that every individual in a state may act agreeably to his will, provided such actions tend not to detriment society. So that if this definition be true, it will naturally follow, that when the peoples' actions are restrained, either by the power of princes,

threats or promiſes of parties, or perſuaſions of places, penſions, and honours, ſuch a people muſt be in a ſtate of ſlavery. In anſwer to this, you may poſſibly aſk. Why are not the people virtuous? They would then be above reſtraint. True, my Lord, they would, then, be above reſtraint; and, in being above reſtraint, they would find, like ſome others, the uſe of a king a mere phantom and ſhew of parade. But the truth is, the people of your kingdom particularly require a guiding intellect. Your ſovereign ſhould be this intellect of the ſtate, to preſerve it from miſ-rule and diſorder.

Such being the liberty of the ſubject, and the duty of the ſovereign, it is your immediate place to entreat your Royal Maſter to look perpetually upon this mirror, where he is depicted with all the truth of deſign, unaſſiſted by the heightenings of colours laid on by a diſtempered or prejudiced fancy. It is not from the aggravating colours of party or prejudice—but from the true ſituation of his people, that he is either virtuous or vicious. I hope, therefore, for his own character, as well as for the happineſs of

his country, he will always find his likeneſs to be *Truth depicting Juſtice*. What heaven-allied reflections will, then, ariſe in his mind, when he ſees a people look up to him alone with gratitude for thoſe bleſſings of human nature—proſperity and protection! But, on the other hand, what infernal torments he muſt endure—if he be not, like moſt tyrants, callous to humanity, who ſees a people receive from him alone thoſe curſes of human nature—Adverſity and Oppreſſion!

LET-

LETTER II.

On a ſeparate Peace.

My LORD,

HAVING in my laſt, of the fifteenth inſtant, juſt treated upon a principle which Mr. FOX had omitted in his admirable ſpeech on American Independence, I have now to ſtate to you what occurs to me on the ſubject in agitation between the belligerent powers.

I KNOW not from whence the idea of a ſeparate peace with us could have originated. Surely there was never a more prepoſterous chimera conceived in the brain of a miniſter. I cannot help pitying the weakneſs of ſuch a requiſition, while I deſpiſe the puny efforts of inſulting our honour as a ſtate. While your affected liberality acknowledged our independence, your actions treated us a people from

from whom no tie of either nature or nation was to be expected. You thought that in affecting to give us the bridle of ſelf dominion, which we had long ſince wreſted from your too-reſtrictive guidance, you emancipated us, at the ſame time, from the laws of reaſon, and policy. We were to demonſtrate to the world that the baſis of American policy was that of treachery and ingratitude. Our temporary gratitude for the ſhadow of acknowledging a right—already poſſeſſed, was to be purchaſed by our perpetual infamy among every other power of the univerſe. Deſtroying treaties that were formed for the ſupport and eſtabliſhment of thoſe natural rights we now poſſeſs, would have effectually ſubverted that fabric of independence, which the ſacrifice of too many lives have raiſed. This may be Britiſh policy—but I truſt it never will be adopted by America. We cannot exiſt but by the preſervation of our honour. We are but yet ſtriplings in power; ſo that we muſt lean againſt other mature ſtems by alliance, before we dare to wanton with power, honour, protection, and humanity.

When

When we are poſſeſſed of your late imperial ſtability, we may be arrogant enough to trifle with our glory, character, and conſequence. We may, poſſibly, extend our government beyond the tone of protection. We may commence tyrants over our ſubjects, inſulters of neighbouring ſtates, and the deſpiſers of political, friendly, and relative alliances. As we have ſeen all this effected through an intoxication of glory and power, I will not ſay how far an increaſe of glory and power may lead us into the like intoxication. But until we have drank deep enough of this draught, which will require a ſeries of years to give it the ſtrength of ſuch an inebriating quality, you muſt conſider we are not likely to fall into thoſe attrocious errors, the cauſe of your variety of misfortunes, and diſgraces. So that while we preſerve our reaſon, you may be certain we ſhall preſerve our honour—and while we preſerve our honour, we ſhall preſerve our independence. For national as well as perſonal honour is the only tenure of independence.

And having, thus, hinted at the impoſſibility of our entering into a treaty of ſeparate peace, I ſhall now proceed to conſider your impolicy in requeſting ſuch a meaſure, could it be adopted conſiſtent with that honour we ſhould preſerve, and the character we have to eſtabliſh.

Are you, my Lord, to know that a ſeparate peace would involve not only us but yourſelves in the greateſt difficulties—if not in abſolute deſtruction? You muſt conſider, that a ſeeming immediate advantage in politics moſt frequently produces a certain remote injury. This poſition would be too much verified in our treaty with each other on the terms of a ſeparate peace. What advantage could derive to you from an alliance with a ſtate, who was deprived of thoſe national connections, dependencies, and ſocialities that give to every country its efficient power and conſequence? Inſtead of enriching you with the returns and exchanges of our foreign commerce, we ſhould only lie an indigeſted burthen on your ſtate?

We

We ſhould corrupt—inſtead of invigorating, the general ſyſtem. We ſhould be barren in ourſelves, and render your commercial connections abortive. For, although the powers of Ruſſia, Germany, Pruſſia, Denmark, and Sweden, may think it conſiſtent with their friendſhip and intereſt to ſave your conſequence as a ſtate, yet they would never countenance your ſeparate alliance with America as independent ſtates. They conſider, that you, in alliance with one quarter of the globe as an independent people, would give you that ſtrength which would threaten the balance of power, ſo inſeparable from the exiſtence of European national independence. They would ſee the difference between your alliance with America as a people—and your government of them as ſubjects. They would know that you might be powerful in the latter inſtance—but in the former you would be irreſiſtable. They would compare it to a certain number of perſons united as two families; or, the ſame number of perſons, governed by one general head. It would, then, clearly appear, that two families, left to ſeek

ach the commercial advantages of ſeparate onnections, muſt be ſtronger, in union, than he ſame number of perſons reſtricted by he will, governed by the power, and confined by the connection of one governor. Thus, you may be aſſured, that you would find it more eaſy to perſuade your enemies to turn their arms in favour of your authority over America, than to perſuade your friends to agree to a ſeparate alliance with us, as a diſtinct people. You may, poſſibly, be deceived by appearance and profeſſion. Neither your penetration or experience in affairs of government are ſuch, as to authorize ſuch an aſſurance of infallibility. I would, therefore, adviſe you, not to confide in the profeſſions of thoſe ſtates who have, long ſince, pretended to further our alliance on ſuch vague, indiſcrimate, and inconſiſtent principles. It may have been policy in them to appear the advocates of ſuch a meaſure.—And it may have been prudence in you to have accepted of it with the confidence which ſhewed your ſenſe of the obligation, and gratitude for their friendly interpoſition. It might have the effect, on their

part,

part, to evince to the ſtates at war with you, their intention of aſſiſting you whenever your enemies might prove ſucceſsful enough to threaten your exiſtence as a people. So far the purpoſe may be anſwered. Indeed I believe our allies are convinced, that the eſtabliſhment of our independence ſhould, and muſt, be the ultimate of their war. But, then, it is natural to ſuppoſe, that ſome advantage muſt be derived to them, from this interpoſition in our favour. It is not conſiſtent with the law of nations to trifle with their ſubjects' blood and treaſure, for the purpoſe merely of eſtabliſhing another's independence. There muſt be an immediate ceſſion, or a remote connection of either commercial or political advantages. It is, therefore, in this point of view, we cannot poſſibly enter with you into a ſeparate alliance. To cede to them any part of our poſſeſſions, would be depriving us of that ſafety which muſt preſerve our internal dominion. For a people never ſuffers a partial diminution of their country, without riſquing the danger of loſing the whole at a future period. Thus we have only the alternative of entering upon a peace on ſuch liberal

terms as will inſure to them a proportionate advantage ariſing from a ſhare of that mutual commerce, which will be our intereſt to eſtabliſh with them. But while we agree to peace on theſe terms, you need not be jealous of loſing any part of that trade which is conſiſtent with our mutual intereſt. You may be aſſured we ſhould conſider it our advantage to purchaſe innumerable commodities of you in preference to any other power. And you would find more advantage in truſting to the liberality of an unreſtrained commerce, than fettering it with reſtrictions that would render it as diſadvantageous to you as it proved burthenſome to America.

HAVING thus far conſidered the impolicy of a ſeparate peace, I ſhall ſay a few words upon the injuſtice, on your part, in making it the baſis of your acknowledgement of our Independence.

ARE you to be informed of its being the oppreſſion of Great-Britain towards America, that has led the other belligerent ſtates into an enormous

enormous expenditure of blood and treaſure! Are you not, then, the efficient cauſe of al the loſſes they may have ſuſtained? It is therefore, the leaſt recompence you can make, to reſtore their captured poſſeſſions, re-inſtate their exhauſted reſources, and ſuffer them to reap the commercial advantages ariſing from us in a general peace, and the recognition of our independence which they have helped to eſtabliſh. Away with national pique and reſentment! They ſhould not characterize the the miniſter of a people from whom America originated. For although we reject your laws, we ſhall always be proud of your character as a nation, to which we are indebted for thoſe ideas of freedom which have ſo happily made us a people.

But why ſhould reſentment be ſo kindled againſt our allies? Has their conduct been contrary to what yours has been under ſimilar circumſtances? They have only delivered us from your yoke of oppreſſion. Did not you emancipate Holland from the yoke of Spaniſh tyranny?

tyranny? And have you not ſince enjoyed the advantage—both political and commercial, ariſing from that independence you helped to eſtabliſh? Why, then, ſhould not our allies follow your example in the happy conſequences—as well as in the fatal means they have purſued for this happy iſſue? You call them your natural enemies—and, therefore, you have enforced the abſolute propriety of a ſeparate peace with us. But I treat the epithet—as merely an epithet which policy not juſtice has adopted. Nature never made the character. Mankind was not formed to be at enmity but in friendſhip with their ſpecies. So that all national enmity does not ariſe from nature—but from power and ambition. It is true, in this inſtance, you are mutual enemies. But in the ſubject now on the tapis, ſet aſide your ambition and oppreſſion, and you will find they have been your friends. For it is in policy as in morality—that a greater friendſhip cannot be performed than reſtraining the culprit from the perpetration of his guilt. They have done you this friendſhip. By their

efforts

efforts you have been prevented from coercing into an abject ſervility, thoſe who now riſe into that political poſſeſſion of independence which is the right of political maturity. The right of freedom conſiſts in the poſſeſſion of power.

FINIS.

13186

LE
211
1F83
1782

4103136